

# **Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

**DOI-BLM-UT-G010–2015–0170–DNA**

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Table of Contents

<b>Finding of No Significant Impact .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
QEP Energy Company's RW 9C1-16A Pipeline Reroute .....	ix
Signature .....	ix
<b>Decision Record .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
Decision .....	xi
Summary of the Selected Alternative .....	xi
Rationale for the Decision .....	xi
Appeals .....	xi
Authorizing Official .....	xi
Conditions of Approval (COAs) .....	xii
<b>1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) .....</b>	<b>1</b>

This page intentionally  
left blank

**List of Tables**

Table 1.1. List of Preparers .....	2
------------------------------------	---

This page intentionally  
left blank

## List of Equations

1.1. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist .....	3
---	---

This page intentionally  
left blank



# **Finding of No Significant Impact**

## **QEP Energy Company's RW 9C1-16A Pipeline Reroute**

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA), and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

### **Signature**

Approved by:

/s/ Jerry Kenczka  
Authorized Officer

9/18/2015  
Date

---

AFM for Minerals

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Decision Record

## Decision

It is my decision to authorize QEP Energy Company's proposed pipeline extension as described in the proposed action of DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0170-DNA.

## Summary of the Selected Alternative

This decision includes the following components:

QEP would reroute the buried pipeline for the RW 9C1-16A up to 154 feet for safety concerns during construction.

## Rationale for the Decision

The proposed pipeline extension meet the BLM's purpose and need to allow the lessee to develop the subject mineral lease indicated above. The need for the action is established by BLM Onshore Orders (43 CFR 3160) which require the BLM to review and approve APDs on all operations conducted on a Federal or Indian oil and gas lease, even with split estate lands.

## Appeals

This decision is effective upon the date it is signed by the authorized officer. The decision is subject to appeal. Under BLM regulation, this decision is subject to administrative review in accordance with 43 CFR 3165. Any request for administrative review of this decision must include information required under 43 CFR 3165.3(b) (State Director Review), including all supporting documentation. Such a request must be filed in writing with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, P.O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84145-0155, within 20 business days of the date this Decision is received or considered to have been received.

If you wish to file a petition for stay, the petition for stay should accompany your notice of appeal and shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits;
3. The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted;
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

## Authorizing Official

Approved by:

/s/ Jerry Kenczka

9/18/2015

---

Authorized Officer

Date

## **Conditions of Approval (COAs)**

- The conditions of approval, as set forth in the original approval for the RW 9C1–16A would be adhered to.

# **Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

*Worksheet*

This page intentionally  
left blank

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management

---

OFFICE: Vernal Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0170

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: QEP Energy Company's RW 9C1-16A pipeline extension

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sections 21, T7S, R22E.

APPLICANT (if any): QEP Energy Company

## **A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures**

QEP Energy Company requests approval to reroute the pipeline in Section 21, T7S, R22E. The project area would be located in Uintah county approximately 25 miles south of Vernal Utah.

## **B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

LUP Name*	<u>Vernal RMP</u>	Date Approved:	<u>October 2008</u>
Other Document	<u>Proposal to Develop</u> <u>Natural Gas Well Pad</u> <u>RW44-16A</u>	Date Approved:	<u>3/27/2015</u>

**The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:**

MIN-8: The Approved RMP will provide for a variety of oil and gas operations and geophysical explorations. These activities will be allowed in the VPA unless precluded by other program prescriptions. The stipulations identified for surface-disturbing activities in Appendix K will generally apply to these activities.

## **C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

**List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.**

January 2015: Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067.

**List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).**

Lease UTU0559

## **D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes, the project is a reroute of the pipeline approved in the Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067. The geographic and resource conditions are the same in the proposed project area as the area analyzed in the Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource value?**

Yes, there has been no change in environmental concerns from the time Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067 was signed to the present time.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Yes, there are no new resource concerns.

**4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

Yes, the proposed action is not adding any additional disturbance, so the potential effects and impacts previously analyzed directly relate to the new disturbance area. See question 3 in regards to air quality.

**5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Yes, scoping and public involvement were carried out in accordance with BLM NEPA Handbook H-I790-1.

## **E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

**Table 1.1. List of Preparers**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Discipline</b>
Kevin Sadlier	Team Lead	Natural Resource Specialist

### **Note**

Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.



**Equation 1.1. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist****Project Title:** QEP Energy Company's RW 9C1-16A Pipeline Reroute**NEPA Log Number:** DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0170-DNA**Project Leader:** Kevin Sadlier**DETERMINATION OF STAFF:** (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
<b>RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)</b>				
NC	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Air quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions were sufficiently analyzed within the DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	BLM Natural Areas	The project area does not lie in any designated BLM Natural Area following GIS review.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Cultural:  Archaeological Resources	Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.16(y) this project is considered to be an undertaking. The area of potential effect (APE) is defined as the polygon presented in the right-of-way application. Montgomery archeological Consultants conducted a Class III 100% pedestrian inventory over the project area. No cultural material was identified within the project area. A consultation letter was sent to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on 18 July 2014 recommending a "no historic properties affected" determination. We received their concurrence to our determination on 24 July 2014.	Erin Goslin	3/10/2015
NP	Cultural:  Native American  Religious Concerns	Tribal consultation was conducted under the Greater Deadman Bench EIS in 2008. No Traditional Cultural properties (TCPs) are identified within the APEs. The proposed projects will not hinder access to or use of Native American religious sites.	Erin Goslin	3/10/2015
NP	Designated Areas:  Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	The project area does not lie in any designated Area of Critical Environmental Concern following GIS review.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Designated Areas:  Wild and Scenic Rivers	None present as per Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015

<b>Determina- tion</b>	<b>Resource/Issue</b>	<b>Rationale for Determination</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
NP	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None present as per Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Environmental Justice	The proposed alternatives would not likely create disproportionately high and adverse human health impacts or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations since there are none in the project area.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Farmlands (prime/unique)	All prime or unique farm lands in the Uintah Basin must be irrigated to be considered under this designation, among other factors. No irrigated lands are located in the proposed action area; therefore this resource will not be carried forward for analysis.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Fuels/Fire Management	There are no past or planned fuels projects in the immediate area. The proposed reclamation activities should prevent additional hazardous fuels.	Kevin Sadler	9/10/2015
NC	Geology/Minerals/Energy Production	Geology/Minerals/Energy Production were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Richard Goshen	9/10/2015
NI	Invasive, Non-Native Species (EO 13112)	Invasive, Non-Native Species were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NI	Lands/Access	The Proposed area is located within the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan area which allows for oil and gas development with associated road and pipeline right-of-ways. The proposed project is within QEP's Red Wash Unit. The Sundry would be authorized under beneficial use of the lease; therefore, this project does not require a ROW.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)	None present as per Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	There are no additional impacts from the proposed project to the livestock operation than those that were analyzed in the previous NEPA document. No new or previously unknown information has been made available related to the previous environmental analysis.	Craig Newman	9/10/2015
NC	Paleontology	Paleontology were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Robin L Hansen	7/8/2015
NC	Plants: BLM Sensitive	BLM Sensitive plants were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Jessi Brunson	
NC	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate plants were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Jessi Brunson	
NP	Plants: Wetland/Riparian	Riparian habitat is not inventoried or known within the project area and the development would not be expected to negatively impact riparian of the Green River indirectly.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015

<b>Determina- tion</b>	<b>Resource/Issue</b>	<b>Rationale for Determination</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
NI	Recreation	There are no recreation sites in this project area. Recreation will not be effected by this project.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NI	Socio-Economics	Effects on social and economic values would be minimal and would not require further analysis due to the small-scale nature of the action when compared to the larger economy in the area.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Visual Resources	Visual Resources were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Wastes (hazardous/solid)	Hazardous Waste: Hazardous Waste has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067  Solid Wastes: Solid Wastes were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Water: Floodplains	Floodplains were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Water Resources Quality (drinking /surface /ground)	Surface: Surface water has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067  Groundwater: Groundwater has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier Richard Goshen	9/10/2015 9/10/2015
NC	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	Hydrologic conditions were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Water: Surface Water Quality	Surface water quality has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Water: Waters of the U.S.	Waters of the U.S. are not present per USGS topographic map and GIS data review. The proposed project would not impact any drainage where a high water mark can be distinguished, drainages which regularly run water, or wetlands/riparian areas.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Wild Horses	Wild Horses were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	Migratory birds were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Dixie Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	Non-USFWS Designated were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Dixie Sadlier	9/10/2015
NC	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate wildlife species were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0067	Dixie Sadlier	9/10/2015
NP	Woodlands/Forestry	Not present in project area as per GIS review.	Kevin Sadlier	9/10/2015

## Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

9/18/2015

K. Sadlier

Signature of Project Lead

9/18/2015

Kelly Buckner

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Jerry Kenczka

Signature of the Responsible Official

9/18/2015

Date

**Note:**

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.